

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/689,469	10/12/2000	Anne Marie Schmidt	0575/55424-A-PCT-US/JPW/J 7726		
75	90 10/18/2006		EXAMINER		
John P. White			YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H		
Cooper & Dunham LLP 1185 Avenue of the Americas			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
New York, NY 10036			1643		
		DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/689,469	SCHMIDT ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Christopher H. Yaen	1643	

	Christopher H. Yaen	1643	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
<u> </u>	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	2021100
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	before or on the date of filing a No I sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			•
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	ice because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13.  Other:		CHRISTOPHER I PRIMARY EXAI Christopher Yaen	H. YAEN Miner
·		Art Unit 1643	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not deemed persuasive. Specifically applicant reiterates the compensatory and/or collateral pathway argument and indicates one of skill in the art would recognize the existance of these pathways. Moreover, applicant indicates that in the absence of the instant disclosure, one of skill in the art would not be able to practice the instant invention. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive to overcome the rejection of record. Applicant's have not submitted any new arguments and or amendments to overcome the rejection of record. The claimed invention is deemed obvious because the art teaches the relationship between amphoterin and rage, and further provides methods of determining this interaction. Those of skill in the art combined with the knowledge of amphoterin localization at the leading edge of tumor cells would, would predictable assay for the interation between amphoterin and RAGE with tumor cells. Therefore, the rejection of claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious is maintained for the reasons of record.

CHRISTOPHER H. YAEN